

# C/CAG

## CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

**1:15 p.m., Thursday, March 20, 2008**  
**San Mateo County Transit District Office<sup>1</sup>**  
**1250 San Carlos Avenue, Second Floor Auditorium**  
**San Carlos, California**

### TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) AGENDA

- |  |                   |               |
|--|-------------------|---------------|
| 1. Public comment on items not on the Agenda (presentations are customarily limited to 3 minutes).   | Porter/<br>McAvoy | No materials. |
| 2. Issues from the last C/CAG Board and CMEQ meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Approved – Contract between C/CAG and Bikemap.com for the San Mateo Co. Bicycle Transportation Map for up to \$35,000</li><li>• Approved – Amendment to the contract between C/CAG and Kimley Horn for an amount of \$321,000 for development of PA/ED for the San Mateo County Smart Corridors project</li><li>• Approved – Appointments of the following members to the C/CAG Legislative Committee: Sepi Richardson (Brisbane), Andy Cohen (Menlo Park), Gina Papan (Millbrae), Kevin Mullin (SSF), and Judith Christensen (Daly City)</li><li>• Approved – Election of Ian Bain (RWC) to the Bicycle/Pedestrian Committee</li><li>• Approved – List of projects for initial submittal to the MTC for consideration in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)</li><li>• Approved – Election of C/CAG Board Chair Deborah Gordon (Woodside) and Vice-Chairs Tom Kasten (Hillsborough) and Irene O'Connell (San Bruno)</li><li>• Approved – Appointment of Daniel Quigg, Council Member from Millbrae, to the CMEQ Committee</li></ul> | Hoang             | No materials. |
| 3. Approval of the Minutes from January 17, 2008   | Hoang             | Page 1-3      |
| 4. Update on the 2020 Peninsula Gateway Corridor Study (Information)   | Hoang             | Pages 4-8     |
| 5. Recommendation of the Fiscal Year 2008/2009 Expenditure Program for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program for San Mateo County (Action)  | Madalena          | Pages 9-11    |
| 6. Recommendation for the 4 <sup>th</sup> Cycle of the Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program  | Madalena          | Pages 12-17   |
| 7. Allocation of local share of funding under the C/CAG Vehicle Registration Fee (AB 1546) Program – FY 07/08 1 <sup>st</sup> Half (Information)   | Hoang             | Pages 18-25   |
| 8. Measure A Strategic Plan Update   | Hurley            | Oral Report   |
| 9. Member Reports.   | All               |               |

---

<sup>1</sup> For public transit access use SamTrans Bus lines 390, 391, 292, KX, PX, RX, or take CalTrain to the San Carlos Station and walk two blocks up San Carlos Avenue. Driving directions: From Route 101 take the Holly Street (west) exit. Two blocks past El Camino Real go left on Walnut. The entrance to the parking lot is at the end of the block on the left, immediately before the ramp that goes under the building. Enter the parking lot by driving between the buildings and making a left into the elevated lot. Follow the signs up to the levels for public parking.

<b>2008 TAC Roster and Attendance</b>		
<b>Member</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Jan</b>
Ian McAvoy (Co-Chair)	SamTrans	yes
Jim Porter (Co-Chair)	San Mateo County Engineering	yes
April Chan	Peninsula Corridor JPB	yes
Bob Beyer	San Mateo Planning	yes
Duncan Jones	Atherton Engineering	yes
Gene Gonzalo	CalTrans	yes
Jon Lynch	Redwood City Engineering	
Joseph Hurley	SMCTA	yes
K. Folan	MTC	
Larry Patterson	San Mateo City Engineering	
<b>VACANT</b>	San Mateo County Planning	
Bill Meeker	Burlingame Planning	
<b>VACANT</b>	Engineering	
Parviz Mokhtari	San Carlos Engineering	yes
Randy Breault	Brisbane Engineering	yes
Ray Davis	Belmont Engineering	
Ray Towne	Foster City Engineering	yes
Reza (Ray) M. Razavi	South San Francisco Engineering	yes
Rick Mao	Colma Engineering	yes
Ron Popp	Millbrae Engineering	yes
Ruben Nino	Menlo Park Engineering	yes
Sandy Wong	C/CAG CMP	yes
Syed Murtuza	Burlingame Engineering	yes
Tatum Mothershead	Daly City Planning	yes
Van Ocampo	Pacifica Engineering	yes

# **TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) FOR THE CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CMP)**

**January 17, 2008  
MINUTES**

The one hundred seventieth (170th) meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, Bacciocco Auditorium.

Co-chair McAvoy called the meeting to order at 1:20 p.m. on Thursday, January 17, 2008.

TAC members attending the meeting are listed on the Roster and Attendance on the preceding page. Others attending the meeting were: John Hoang – C/CAG; Richard Napier – C/CAG; Tom Madalena, C/CAG; Jim Bigelow – CMEQ; Pat Dixon – Patrick Sweetland – Daly City; Henry Louie (San Carlos); Brian Lee – San Mateo Co.; Ron Moriguchi (Caltrans); Karen Borrmann (Belmont); Randy Durrenberger (KHA)

**1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.**

There were no public comments.

Co-chair McAvoy made an announcement that there will be a couple of vacancies. With the passing of Mark Duino, there will be one vacancy for a County planner. In addition, with the retirement of Mo Sharma (Daly City), there will also be a vacancy for an engineering position. Co-chair Porter will report back at the next meeting with regards to filling the County planner vacancy. The Co-chairs would like to maintain a high attendance record for the meetings.

**2. Issues from the last C/CAG and CMEQ meetings.**

As shown on the Agenda.

**3. Approval of the Minutes from October 18, 2007.**

Approved.

**4. Update on the Traffic Incident Management – Alternative Route Plan and San Mateo County Smart Corridors Projects**

John Hoang & Randy Durrenberger presented on the two projects.

- The update of the Alternative Route project includes handouts representing a sample alternate route layout and traffic management communication.
- The Traffic Incident Management Committee (TIMC) oversees the development of the draft report, which will be ready to be distributed to the TAC and all stakeholders shortly.
- Who is on the TIMC? The Traffic Incident Management Committee includes local city public works, fire, police, CHP, and Caltrans.
- Progress includes completion of the draft Plan, Infrastructure Improvement Plan, working on a draft Cooperation Agreement (or MOU), held one Workshop, and development of performance measures.

- Work on the Alternate Route Plan has provided a base for the development of the Smart Corridors project.
- The Smart Corridors project encompasses US 101 and El Camino Real from I-380 south to the County line and includes deployment of Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) elements. The project consists of three segments totaling approximately \$30M for engineering and construction cost.
- Staff plans on submitting segments 1 & 2 of the Smart Corridors project (total project cost of \$20M) to the Traffic Light Synchronization Program (TLSP). The TLSP is funded from Prop 1B.
- Currently working with Caltrans in drafting a Project Study Report.
- Will we be looking at capacity improvements on El Camino Real? We will coordinate with Caltrans as the project progresses.
- We have the capital cost but have we considered operations and maintenance costs? Preliminary O&M costs are about 8-10%. More detailed cost estimates will be determined as the project progresses.

**5. Recommendation on list of projects for initial submittal to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for consideration in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update (Transportation 2035)**

Sandy Wong presented the report. It was requested that project sponsors provide a more comprehensive list of projects for consideration into the process. More involvement will be needed in working with transit projects. Questions and comments are as follows:

- Are we going to be constraining any projects submission based on a screening process? Do projects need to be consistent with the current countywide transportation and transit planning process? Yes, projects should align with existing long-range plans.
- For 100% locally funded projects, if any federal actions are needed (e.g., air quality issues), then provide those projects to be included also.
- Are there more details on these projects? Additional information and updated information will be needed from the sponsors.
- C/CAG staff will need to work with project sponsors to obtain project information and submit to MTC by March 5th.
- Clarification on the March 5<sup>th</sup> deadline, it was decided that project sponsors submit information to Sandy to have a comprehensive list by February 8<sup>th</sup>.
- The RTP is an important document and projects not listed the document will not get funded.

**6. Review of the shuttle ridership statistics for the first quarter of FY 2007/08**

- No presentation.

**7. Measure A Strategic Plan Update**

Joe Hurley provided an update.

- Subcommittee made up of city managers and public works directors was created. The subcommittee has met twice.
- A technical subcommittee of that group was also formed to address issues including potential inequity of mainline versus non-mainline, geographic equity. Findings from this technical committee will be brought up to the Subcommittee and to the February TAC meeting.
- What is the expected schedule for the Public Workshops/outreach? It is anticipated that the outreach will be held in the spring.

## 8. Member Reports

Richard Napier, Executive Director of C/CAG, reported that the SB613, which was the renewal of the \$4 vehicle license fee in San Mateo County (AB 1546), was vetoed with comments. It was requested that an update of the program be provided. Additional comments received by the Governor's office included that the duration of the extension should be 4 years instead of the proposed 10 years. C/CAG is working on the final three-year program report and Executive Summary for submission to the legislature and governor. It is requested that letters of support be provided to C/CAG for the new bill ~~SB713~~ (the latest bill numbers is SB348.) Letters of support from the cities are critical and we will need the letters within 3 weeks. Sample letters will be sent out to the cities.

Regarding the Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit, a hearing will be held on March 11<sup>th</sup>. The purpose of the hearing is that the Water Board is soliciting testimony on the formal draft version of the Municipal Regional Stormwater permit (MRP) released for public comment in December 2007. It is requested that either an elected official or staff person from each city attend the hearing for representation. Additional information will be forthcoming. This item will be brought to the TAC for presentation in February.

Meeting adjourned.

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** March 20, 2008  
**To:** CMP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**From:** John Hoang  
**Subject:** Update on the 2020 Peninsula Gateway Corridor Study  
(For further information contact John Hoang at 363-4105)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the TAC receives an update on the 2020 Peninsula Gateway Corridor Study. This item is for information only. No action is required.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

\$589,000 jointly funded by C/CAG (25%), San Mateo County Transportation Authority (25%), and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (50%)

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

Funding for C/CAG's share is from the federal planning funds provided to C/CAG by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

The 2020 Gateway Study was one of the recommendations from the Bay Crossing Study. The purpose of the Study, which began in 2003, is to identify short, medium and long-term options for addressing congestion issues relating to the approaches to the Dumbarton Bridge and Highway 101 between Routes 84 and 85. The objective of the study is to define and evaluate traffic improvements in the study area that address the Study goals which includes: facilitating access; enhancing economic opportunities; optimizing use of existing infrastructure; reducing congestion and local community impacts; and minimizing environmental impacts on sensitive resources.

Study accomplishments to date includes the establishment of the universe of potential project alternatives, preliminary review and identification of potential issues, and the development of next step strategies to further evaluate and implement specific projects. An assessment of relative benefits, costs, and impacts for these project alternatives was conducted and summarized in assessment tables that utilizes a simple "high-medium-low" approach.

## **ATTACHMENT**

- Universe of Alternative Assessment Matrix

HIGHWAY 101									
ID Code	Alternative	Location	Traffic Benefits		Construction Cost (2006\$)	Potential Impacts			
		Change in Roadway Congestion <i>(Expressed in ranges of travel time savings (min))</i>	Decrease commute traffic on residential streets? <i>(Expressed in ranges of peak period traffic volume)</i>	Visual/ Aesthetics		Noise	Environment	Right-of-Way	
A	Route 101 Auxiliary Lanes	MV, PA	See “Comparison” Chart (ALT 1)						
B	Reconstruct Embarcadero/Oregon Interchange	MV, PA	⊙	⊙	\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
C	Reconstruct San Antonio interchange and eliminate southbound on ramp at Charleston	MV, PA	●	-	\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
D1	Widen freeway to 10 lanes (County Line to Shoreline)	MV, PA	●	-	\$\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
D2	Widen freeway to 10 lanes + Aux Lanes (County Line to Shoreline)	MV, PA	●	-	\$\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	○	○
E	Widen freeway to 10 lanes + Aux Lanes (Whipple to County Line)	RC, MP, EPA, PA	●	-	\$\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	○	○
F	Route 101 Elevated Express Lanes	MV, PA, EPA, MP, RC	See “Comparison” Chart (ALT 2)						
G	Improve local ability to cross 101	MV, PA, EPA, MP, RC	-	-	\$\$	-	-	⊙	⊙

CONNECTING BRIDGE AND HIGHWAY 101									
ID Code	Alternative	Location	Traffic Benefits		Construction Cost (2006\$)	Potential Impacts			
			Change in Roadway Congestion <i>(Expressed in ranges of travel time savings (min))</i>	Decrease commute traffic on residential streets? <i>(Expressed in ranges of peak period traffic volume)</i>		Visual/ Aesthetics	Noise	Environment	Right-of-Way
H	Grade Separations on Bayfront Expressway	EPA, MP	See “Comparison” Chart (ALT 3)						
I	Extend Bayfront Expressway to Woodside Road	MP, RC	●	⊙	\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	○	○
J	Construct direct flyover connection between Bayfront/ Marsh and 101 north of Marsh	MP, RC	⊙	⊙	\$\$\$	○	⊙	⊙	○
K	Elevated Direct Connections between Bayfront and 101 along Willow Road Corridor	EPA, MP	This project has been replaced by improvement CC						
L	Elevated roadway along Dumbarton RR corridor between University and 101	EPA, MP	●	⊙	\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	○	⊙
M	New 101 South connection through East Palo Alto (Expressway south of University)	EPA, MP	●	●	\$\$\$\$\$	○	○	○	○
N	New 101 South connection skirting East Palo Alto (Expressway/viaduct along edge of bay)	EPA, PA	●	●	\$\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	○	○
O	Tunnel beneath East Palo Alto	EPA	●	●	\$\$\$\$\$	●	●	●	⊙
P	San Francisquito Creek Diversion Structure and Roadway (dual use tunnel facility)	EPA, PA	⊙	⊙	\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	○	⊙
P1	Route 101 flood control project potentially down Willow Road.	EPA, MP	-	-	\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	○	⊙

Location Key					
EPA	East Palo Alto	MP	Menlo Park	MV	Mountain View
PA	Palo Alto	RC	Redwood City		

Construction Cost Key					
\$\$\$\$\$	>\$500M	\$\$\$\$	\$200M-\$500M	\$\$\$	\$50M-\$200M
\$\$	\$1M-\$50M	\$	<\$1M		

ASSESSMENT KEY		
	TRAFFIC BENEFITS	POTENTIAL IMPACTS
●	Improvement	Less-Than-Significant
⊙	Small Improvement	Less-Than-Significant <small>(w/ MITIGATION)</small>
○	Degrade	Significant
-	No Change	None

WILLOW ROAD									
ID Code	Alternative	Location	Traffic Benefits		Construction Cost (2006\$)	Potential Impacts			
			Change in Roadway Congestion <i>(Expressed in ranges of travel time savings (min))</i>	Decrease commute traffic on residential streets? <i>(Expressed in ranges of peak period traffic volume)</i>		Visual/ Aesthetics	Noise	Environment	Right-of-Way
Q	Short-term operational improvements on Willow Road	EPA, MP	See “Comparison” Chart (ALT 4)						
R	Prohibit left turns during peak travel periods	EPA, MP	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	⊙	-
S	Prohibit local cross traffic during peak travel periods	EPA, MP	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	-
T	Exit/Entrance Right Turn pockets on Willow	EPA, MP	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	-	⊙
U	Set back curb line one lane width from traveled way at driveways	EPA, MP	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	○
V	Eliminate driveway access on Willow	EPA, MP	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	-
W	Eliminate selected signalized intersections: · Newbridge St · Ivy Dr · Hamilton Ave	EPA, MP	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	-
X	Eliminate signalized intersections and allow right turns only on/off Willow	EPA, MP	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	-
Y	Eliminate signalized intersections and prohibit any access from local streets	EPA, MP	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	-
Z	Widen Willow one lane each direction	EPA, MP	●	●	\$\$\$	○	⊙	○	○
AA	Grade separations at selected intersections: · Newbridge St · Ivy Dr · Hamilton Ave	EPA, MP	●	●	\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	○	○
BB	Pedestrian over crossing at Ivy Dr (near Mid-Peninsula High School)	EPA, MP	-	-	\$	○	-	-	⊙

WILLOW ROAD (CONT'D)									
ID Code	Alternative	Location	Traffic Benefits		Construction Cost (2006\$)	Potential Impacts			
			Change in Roadway Congestion <small>(Expressed in ranges of travel time savings (min))</small>	Decrease commute traffic on residential streets? <small>(Expressed in ranges of peak period traffic volume)</small>		Visual/ Aesthetics	Noise	Environment	Right-of-Way
CC1	Elevated viaduct expressway structure • 2 lanes in each direction	EPA, MP	●	⊙	\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	⊙	○
CC2 (Alt 6)	Elevated viaduct expressway structure • 1 lane in each direction	EPA, MP	See “Comparison” Chart (ALT 6)						
CC3	Elevated viaduct expressway structure • Reversible 2 lanes	EPA, MP	●	⊙	\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	⊙	⊙
CC4	Elevated viaduct expressway structure • 3 lanes with reversible middle lane	EPA, MP	●	⊙	\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	⊙	⊙
DD1	Depressed expressway • 2 lanes in each direction	EPA, MP	●	⊙	\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	○
DD2	Depressed expressway • 1 lane in each direction	EPA, MP	●	⊙	\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
DD3	Depressed expressway • Reversible 2 lanes	EPA, MP	●	⊙	\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
DD4	Depressed expressway • 3 lanes with reversible middle lane	EPA, MP	●	⊙	\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
EE	Grade separations at all intersections (over crossings or under crossings)	EPA, MP	●	●	\$\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	○	○
FF	Tunnel Expressway (maintaining existing facility at grade)	EPA, MP	●	●	\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
GG	Willow Road Depressed/Cantilevered Express Lanes	EPA, MP	See “Comparison” Chart (ALT 7)						

Location Key					Construction Cost Key				
EPA	East Palo Alto	MP	Menlo Park	MV	Mountain View	PA	Palo Alto	RC	Redwood City
\$\$\$\$\$	>\$500M	\$\$\$\$	\$200M-\$500M	\$\$\$	\$50M-\$200M	\$\$	\$1M-\$50M	\$	<\$1M

ASSESSMENT KEY		
	TRAFFIC BENEFITS	POTENTIAL IMPACTS
●	Improvement	Less-Than-Significant
⊙	Small Improvement	Less-Than-Significant <i>(w/ MITIGATION)</i>
○	Degrade	Significant
-	No Change	None



UNIVERSITY AVENUE									
ID Code	Alternative	Location	Traffic Benefits		Construction Cost (2006\$)	Potential Impacts			
			Change in Roadway Congestion <i>(Expressed in ranges of travel time savings (min))</i>	Decrease commute traffic on residential streets? <i>(Expressed in ranges of peak period traffic volume)</i>		Visual/ Aesthetics	Noise	Environment	Right-of-Way
HH	Short-term operational improvements on University Avenue	EPA	See “Comparison” Chart (ALT 7)						
II	Prohibit left turns during peak travel periods	EPA	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	⊙	-
JJ	Prohibit local cross traffic during peak travel periods	EPA	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	-
KK	Entrance/Exit Right Turn pockets on University	EPA	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	-	⊙
LL	Set back curb line one lane width from traveled way at driveways	EPA	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	○
MM	Eliminate driveway access on University	EPA	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	-
NN	Eliminate selected signalized intersections: · Bell · Runnymede · Kavanaugh	EPA	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	-
OO	Eliminate signalized intersections and allow right turns only on/off University	EPA	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	-
PP	Eliminate signalized intersections and prohibit any access from local streets	EPA	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	○	-
QQ	Widen University one lane each direction	EPA	●	●	\$\$\$	○	⊙	○	○
RR	Grade separations at selected intersections: · Donohoe · Bay	EPA	●	●	\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	○	○

UNIVERSITY AVENUE (CONT'D)									
ID Code	Alternative	Location	Traffic Benefits		Construction Cost (2006\$)	Potential Impacts			
			Change in Roadway Congestion <small>(Expressed in ranges of travel time savings (min))</small>	Decrease commute traffic on residential streets? <small>(Expressed in ranges of peak period traffic volume)</small>		Visual/ Aesthetics	Noise	Environ-ment	Right-of-Way
SS1	Elevated expressway/viaduct along University corridor • 2 lanes each direction	EPA	⊙	●	\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	⊙	○
SS2	Elevated viaduct expressway structure • 1 lane in each direction	EPA	○	●	\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	⊙	⊙
SS3	Elevated viaduct expressway structure • Reversible 2 lanes	EPA	⊙	●	\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	⊙	⊙
SS4	Elevated viaduct expressway structure • 3 lanes with reversible middle	EPA	●	●	\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	⊙	○
TT1	Depressed expressway • 2 lanes each direction	EPA	⊙	●	\$\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	○
TT2	Depressed expressway • 1 lane in each direction	EPA	○	●	\$\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
TT3	Depressed expressway • Reversible 2 lanes	EPA	⊙	●	\$\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
TT4	Depressed expressway • 3 lanes with reversible middle lane	EPA	●	●	\$\$\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	○
UU	Grade separations at all intersections (over crossings or under crossings)	EPA	●	●	\$\$\$\$\$	○	⊙	○	○
VV	Tunnel Expressway, (maintain exist- ing facility at grade)	EPA	●	●	\$\$\$\$\$	●	●	●	⊙
WW	University Avenue Depressed/ Cantilevered Express Lanes	EPA	See “Comparison” Chart (ALT 9)						

ASSESSMENT KEY		
	TRAFFIC BENEFITS	POTENTIAL IMPACTS
●	Improvement	Less-Than-Significant
⊙	Small Improvement	Less-Than-Significant <small>(w/ MITIGATION)</small>
○	Degrade	Significant
-	No Change	None

Location Key					Construction Cost Key				
EPA	East Palo Alto	MP	Menlo Park	MV	Mountain View	PA	Palo Alto	RC	Redwood City
\$\$\$\$\$	>\$500M	\$\$\$\$\$	\$200M-\$500M	\$\$\$7	\$50M-\$200M	\$\$	\$1M-\$50M	\$	<\$1M

INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS (ITS)									
ID Code	Alternative	Location	Traffic Benefits		Construction Cost (2006\$)	Potential Impacts			
			Change in Roadway Congestion <small>(Expressed in ranges of travel time savings (min))</small>	Decrease commute traffic on residential streets? <small>(Expressed in ranges of peak period traffic volume)</small>		Visual/Aesthetics	Noise	Environment	Right-of-Way
XX	Install traffic signal interconnect/communications infrastructure on arterials between Middlefield Road	ALL	⊙	⊙	\$\$	-	-	-	-
YY	Install transit signal priority to support high-patronage bus routes.	ALL	⊙	⊙	\$\$	-	-	-	-
ZZ	Install trailblazers and/or arterial CMS to provide route guidance information	ALL	⊙	⊙	\$\$	-	-	-	-
AAA	Prepare Incident Management and Traveler Information Plan for Corridor	ALL	⊙	⊙	\$	-	-	-	-

OTHER									
ID Code	Alternative	Location	Traffic Benefits		Construction Cost (2006\$)	Potential Impacts			
			Change in Roadway Congestion <small>(Expressed in ranges of travel time savings (min))</small>	Decrease commute traffic on residential streets? <small>(Expressed in ranges of peak period traffic volume)</small>		Visual/Aesthetics	Noise	Environment	Right-of-Way
BBB	Study the possible designation of East Bayshore (San Antonio to University) as a reliever route to provide congestion relief and for incident management on Route 101 · Improve operations at intersections · Install directional signage to help keep commuters off residential streets	PA, EPA	-	-	\$	-	-	-	-
CCC1	Improve 101/University interchange · Construct Phase 2 improvements (Part A = SB direct connect off-ramp, Part B = Bike access)	PA, EPA	⊙	⊙	\$\$	●	●	●	●
CCC2	Improve 101/University interchange · Improve on-off connections for northbound traffic	PA, EPA	⊙	⊙	\$\$\$	⊙	⊙	⊙	⊙
DDD	Define residential traffic management elements that complement high priority capital improvements	ALL	-	●	\$	-	-	●	-
EEE	Extend Central Expressway to Sand Hill Road	PA	●	●	\$\$\$\$\$	○	○	○	○

Location Key					
EPA	East Palo Alto	MP	Menlo Park	MV	Mountain View
PA	Palo Alto	RC	Redwood City		

Construction Cost Key					
\$\$\$\$\$	>\$500M	\$\$\$\$	\$200M-\$500M	\$\$\$	\$50M-\$200M
\$\$	\$1M-\$50M	\$	<\$1M		

ASSESSMENT KEY		
	TRAFFIC BENEFITS	POTENTIAL IMPACTS
●	Improvement	Less-Than-Significant
⊙	Small Improvement	Less-Than-Significant <small>(w/ MITIGATION)</small>
○	Degrade	Significant
-	No Change	None

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** March 20, 2008

**To:** Technical Advisory Committee

**From:** Tom Madalena

**Subject:** Recommendation of the Fiscal Year 2008/2009 Expenditure Program for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program for San Mateo County.

(For further information or questions contact Tom Madalena at 599-1460)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Technical Advisory Committee endorse the recommendations contained in this report for the Fiscal Year 2008/2009 Expenditure Program for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program for San Mateo County.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

The allocation of TFCA funds for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008/2009 is expected to be approximately \$1,145,909 of which \$52,909 (approx. 5%) will be allocated to administration. It is recommended that the remaining funds (\$1,093,000) be distributed based on the policies adopted in past years by C/CAG with modifications detailed in the discussion section. The following table shows how the funds would be distributed based on these policies. The funding provided in these categories for the past three years is also shown.

<i>CATEGORY</i>		<i>2005/2006</i>	<i>2006/2007</i>	<i>2007/2008</i>	<i>2008/2009</i>
Employer Based Shuttle Projects	SamTrans	\$605,000	\$638,000	\$576,000	\$634,000
	Menlo Park	\$40,000	\$45,000	\$41,000	See Background /Discussion
County-wide Voluntary Trip Reduction Program (Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance)		\$430,000	\$450,000	\$412,000	\$459,000
Administration		\$50,000	\$51,397	\$49,099	\$52,909
Totals		\$1,125,000	\$1,184,397	\$1,078,099	\$1,145,909

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District) is authorized under Health and Safety code Section 44223 and 44225 to levy a fee on motor vehicles. Funds generated by the fee are referred to as the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) funds and are used to implement projects to reduce air pollution from motor vehicles. Health and Safety Code Section 44241(d) stipulates that forty percent (40%) of funds generated within a county where the fee is in effect shall be allocated by the Air District to one or more public agencies designated to receive the funds, and for San Mateo County, C/CAG has been designated as the overall Program Manager to receive the funds.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

As the Program Manager for the TFCA funds, C/CAG has allocated these funds to fund projects in San Mateo County operated by SamTrans, The City of Menlo Park, and the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance (Alliance). For the last ten years the C/CAG Board has allocated the funds for the SamTrans and City of Menlo Park Shuttle Bus Programs and the Alliance Countywide Voluntary Trip Reduction Program. It is recommended that the same methodology be used for the FY 2008/2009 TFCA Program allocation with the exception of the Menlo Park Shuttle Program. The Menlo Park Shuttle Program has had difficulties meeting the cost-effectiveness policy described below. Therefore the City of Menlo Park has been encouraged to apply for shuttle funds from the C/CAG Local Shuttle Program under the Congestion Relief Program. The four percent share of TFCA funds that has been allocated to Menlo Park in the past has been distributed equally between the Alliance and SamTrans for the FY 2008/2009 Expenditure Program recommendation.

- It is recommended that the SamTrans Shuttle Program receive an allocation of \$634,000 for its current shuttle program and maintain the existing cost sharing formula with SamTrans contributing approximately 25% of the cost of these shuttles and the remaining 25% through employer contributions. This funding recommendation shall be contingent upon SamTrans submitting an acceptable work plan for use of the funds.
- It is recommended that Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance receive an allocation of \$459,000 in TFCA funds and receive \$550,000 from the Congestion Relief Plan for a total allocation of \$1,009,000 for its County-wide Voluntary Trip Reduction Program.

The following are the C/CAG Board policies that will continue to be in effect for the FY 2008/2009 Program.

### Overall Policies:

- Cost Effectiveness, as defined by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), will be used as initial screening criteria for all projects. Projects must show a cost effectiveness of less than \$90,000 per ton of reduced emissions based upon the TFCA funds allocated in order to be considered.
- The funds allocated for the Alliance are subject to the submission of an acceptable work plan for use of the funds.

### Shuttle Projects:

- Shuttle projects are defined as the provision of local feeder bus or shuttle service to rail and ferry stations and airports.
- All shuttles must be timed to meet the rail or ferry lines being served.
- C/CAG encourages the use of electric and other clean fuel vehicles for shuttles.
- Beginning with the 2003-04 TFCA funding cycle, all vehicles used in any shuttle/feeder bus service must meet the applicable California Air Resources Board (CARB) particulate matter standards for public transit fleets. This requirement has been made by the BAAQMD and is applicable to the projects funded by the Congestion Management Agencies.

If the recommendations are accepted, the following is a summary of the C/CAG TFCA Program for FY 2008/2009:

<b>Project</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
Administration	\$52,909
SamTrans	\$634,000
Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance	\$459,000
Total funds obligated	\$1,145,909
Total funds anticipated	\$1,145,909
Balance	\$0

### **ATTACHMENTS**

None

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** March 20, 2008  
**To:** Technical Advisory Committee  
**From:** Tom Madalena  
**Subject:** Recommendation for the 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle of the Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program

(For further information please contact Tom Madalena at 650-599-1460)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the TAC consider the approval of the following projects (presented in attached summary) for the 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle of the Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

This initiative will help cities that are approving Transit Oriented Development (TOD) projects receive money earmarked for transportation projects. The cities with qualified projects that begin construction on TOD housing within 2 years will receive the financial incentive once the project is built.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

There is \$3,000,000 available for the 4th Cycle of the program. The funding sources include the State Transportation Improvement Program and the Transportation for Livable Communities Program. All unused funds will be returned to the program for use in a later cycle.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

The objective of this program is to encourage high-density housing (greater than 40 units per acre) within 1/3 of a mile of a BART or Caltrain station or on El Camino Real/Mission Street in San Mateo County. For eligible housing projects, C/CAG will make a commitment to program the incentive funds to a transportation project identified by the sponsor if the housing is under construction within two years.

There are 10 projects that are being recommended for approval for the 4th Cycle of the Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program. There were a total of eleven applications received. One application did not qualify since it was a Specific Plan project and not a housing project. Staff is still working with a few applicants to verify information presented in the

applications. The projects that qualified collectively include 2,446 bedrooms of which 491 will be affordable to low and moderate-income households. Based on the number of bedrooms approved there will be \$1,202 available for each bedroom built and an additional \$122 available for each affordable bedroom built.

In order to determine the dollar amount for each bedroom we multiplied the number of bedrooms and affordable bedrooms times \$2000 and \$250, respectively. From this we determined the percentage share that each category (regular bedrooms and affordable bedrooms) would have with an unlimited amount of money. It was calculated that of the \$3,000,000, 98% of it would be available for regular bedrooms and 2% would be available for affordable bedrooms. Given this breakdown we have \$1,202 available for each regular bedroom and \$122 available for each affordable bedroom.

Example:      2,446 bedrooms X \$2000 = \$4,892,000 == 98% of \$5,014,750  
                 491 affordable bedrooms X \$250 = \$122,750 == 2% of \$5,014,750

\$3,000,000 X 98% = \$2,940,000  
\$3,000,000 X 2% = \$60,000

\$2,940,000 / 2,446 = \$1,201.96  
\$60,000 / 491 = \$122.20

The ten projects being recommended for funding during this cycle demonstrate that there are a number of new high-density residential projects on the horizon in San Mateo County. From the new San Carlos Transit Village to the Mission and Westlake Mixed-Use project in Daly City, there continues to be new high-density infill projects. For the 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle of the program the program was made available to projects that are on the El Camino Real/Mission Street. For the 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle there are five projects that are on the El Camino Real/Mission Street. Four of the five that are on the El Camino Real/Mission Street are also within 1/3 mile of a transit station.

## ATTACHMENT

### Summary of Recommended Projects - 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle

## Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program

### Summary of Recommended Projects – 4<sup>th</sup> Cycle

Applicant:	City of San Mateo
Project Name:	Goodyear Site/Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition
Address:	2901 and 2905 S. El Camino Real, San Mateo, CA
Description:	The Mid-Peninsula Housing Coalition proposes to demolish two existing commercial buildings onsite, and construct a 4 story mixed-use building with 67 affordable residential units and approximately 2,698 square feet of commercial space.
Number of Units:	67 units
Number of Bedrooms:	153
Density:	67 units/acre
Distance from Transit Station or ECR/Mission Street:	1,350 feet from Caltrain, El Camino Real
Non-Residential Uses:	2,698 square feet of commercial
Affordable housing incentive:	100% (153 bedrooms)
Eligible for \$	\$203,000

Applicant:	City of San Mateo
Project Name:	Delaware Place
Address:	2090 South Delaware Street, San Mateo, CA
Description:	
Number of Units:	111 units
Number of Bedrooms:	213
Density:	47 units/acre
Distance from Transit Station or ECR/Mission Street:	1/4 mile
Non-Residential Uses:	NA
Affordable housing incentive:	10% Affordable (22 bedrooms)
Eligible for \$	\$259,000

Applicant:	City of Daly City
Project Name:	Mission & Westlake – Mixed Use
Address:	6800 Mission Street (at Westlake Ave.), Daly City, CA
Description:	This project fronts Mission Street and is comprised of 36 residential units and 5,900 square feet of retail/office space. The project site is approximately 0.4 acres.
Number of Units:	36 (32 two-bedroom units, 4 three-bedroom units)
Number of Bedrooms:	76
Density:	90 units/acre
Distance from Transit Station or ECR/Mission Street:	Mission Street
Non-Residential Uses:	5,900 square feet of retail/office space
Affordable housing incentive:	20% (17 bedrooms)
Eligible for \$	\$93,000



Applicant:	City of Daly City
Project Name:	Peninsula Habitat for Humanity
Address:	7555 Mission Street (at A Street), Daly City, CA
Description:	This project consists of a 36-unit project on a 0.7-acre site. 100% of the units are to be designated for low-moderate income households. The project fronts Mission Street and is within one-third mile of the Colma BART station.
Number of Units:	36 residential units
Number of Bedrooms:	106
Density:	51 units/acre
Distance from Transit Station or ECR/Mission Street:	600 feet from BART, Mission Street
Non-Residential Uses:	NA
Affordable housing incentive:	100% affordable (106 bedrooms)
Eligible for \$	\$140,000

Applicant:	City of Daly City
Project Name:	American Senior Living – Monarch Village
Address:	165 Pierce Street (at Sullivan Ave.), Daly City, CA
Description:	This project combines 208 residential units with 15,400 square feet of retail space. Fifteen percent of the units are to be designated for low-moderate income seniors.
Number of Units:	208 residential units
Number of Bedrooms:	229
Density:	57 units/acre
Distance from Transit Station or ECR/Mission Street:	<1000 feet to Colma BART
Non-Residential Uses:	15,400 square feet of retail space
Affordable housing incentive:	15% affordable (34 bedrooms)
Eligible for \$	\$279,000

Applicant:	City of Millbrae
Project Name:	Park Paradise
Address:	Northwest corner of National Ave. an Commodore Dr. San Bruno, CA
Description:	This project will include 146 condominium units and 22,000 square feet of transit oriented retail on El Camino Real. There will be 20 low-moderate housing units supported by developer contributions and Millbrae Redevelopment Agency housing assistance. Additionally, the project will include a public frontage road on El Camino Real.
Number of Units:	146 condominiums
Number of Bedrooms:	292
Density:	60 units/acre
Distance from Transit Station or ECR/Mission Street:	600 feet from Millbrae Station, El Camino Real
Non-Residential Uses:	22,000 square feet of transit oriented retail
Affordable housing incentive:	10% affordable (40 bedrooms)
Eligible for \$	\$356,000

Applicant:	City of San Bruno
Project Name:	Parcel 3 & 4 Condominiums at The Crossing
Address:	470 San Mateo Avenue, San Bruno, CA
Description:	This project consists of 350 market rate units. The Crossing is a 20-acre transit oriented development with an emphasis on pedestrian activity located within the Navy Site Specific Plan Area in San Bruno.
Number of Units:	350 market rate condominiums
Number of Bedrooms:	544 bedrooms
Density:	58 units/acre
Distance from Transit Station or ECR/Mission Street:	1/3 mile from BART
Non-Residential Uses:	NA
Affordable housing incentive:	NA
Eligible for \$	\$654,000

Applicant:	City of San Bruno
Project Name:	Peninsular Plaza
Address:	400-418 San Mateo Avenue, San Bruno, CA
Description:	This project will be a three story mixed-use building with two floors of condominiums over ground floor commercial use and underground parking.
Number of Units:	48 units
Number of Bedrooms:	93
Density:	48 units/acre
Distance from Transit Station or ECR/Mission Street:	1/3 mile to Caltrain
Non-Residential Uses:	15,545 square feet of commercial space
Affordable housing incentive:	17.5% affordable (16 bedrooms)
Eligible for \$	\$114,000

Applicant:	City of San Carlos
Project Name:	San Carlos Transit Village
Address:	East side of El Camino Real from Oak St. to San Carlos Ave., San Carlos, CA
Description:	This project will include four story residential buildings over parking garages as well as 34,600 square feet of retail/commercial space. A multi modal transit station and drop off point are proposed south of the depot. A pedestrian plaza and public gathering space in front of the historic depot are also proposed.
Number of Units:	281 units
Number of Bedrooms:	532
Density:	55.8 units/acre
Distance from Transit Station or ECR/Mission Street:	Adjacent to San Carlos Caltrain Station, El Camino Real
Non-Residential Uses:	34,600 square feet of retail/commercial space
Affordable housing incentive:	15% (79 bedrooms)
Eligible for \$	\$649,000

Applicant:	City of Menlo Park
Project Name:	Derry Mixed-Use Project
Address:	580 Oak Grove Avenue, Menlo Park, CA
Description:	Ten three-story buildings including 108 residential condominium units and 24,925 square feet of commercial condominium space would be constructed, along with 301 parking spaces in a partially submerged parking garage.
Number of Units:	108 residential condominium units
Number of Bedrooms:	208
Density:	40 units/acre
Distance from Transit Station or ECR/Mission Street:	75 feet from Caltrain Station and 150 feet from El Camino Real
Non-Residential Uses:	12,275 sq. ft. of office space and 12,650 sq. ft. of retail space for a total of 24,925 sq. ft. of commercial space
Affordable housing incentive:	15% affordable (24 bedrooms)
Eligible for \$	\$253,000

Note – Grant amounts are rounded to the nearest \$1,000 per State and Federal requirements.

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** March 20, 2008  
**To:** CMP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**From:** John Hoang  
**Subject:** Allocation of local share of funding under the C/CAG Vehicle Registration Fee (AB 1546) Program – Fiscal Year 2007/08 (1<sup>st</sup> Half)  
(For further information contact John Hoang at 363-4105)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the TAC receives the information regarding allocation of local share of funding under the C/CAG vehicle registration fee (AB 1546) program for Fiscal Year 2007/08 (1<sup>st</sup> Half).

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

As part of AB 1546, fifty percent (50%) of the fees collected minus administration costs of the AB 1546 vehicle license fees on motor vehicles registered in San Mateo County is dedicated for the congestion management and stormwater pollution prevention programs for local jurisdictions within the County.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

AB 1546 fund comes from the \$4 vehicle license fee in San Mateo County.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

Allocations of local shares of the funding received under the Vehicle License Fee (AB 1546) Program are available two times per fiscal year. Funds collected between July 1, 2007 and December 31, 2007 will be made available to jurisdictions through a 1<sup>st</sup> half allocation. Jurisdictions will be able to submit a request for reimbursement for work performed and expenses incurred during the 1<sup>st</sup> half of Fiscal Year 2007/08 up to the allocated amount. Funds are provided on a reimbursement basis only for work performed under the traffic congestion management and stormwater pollution prevention program established criteria.

Similar to the previous allocation cycles, a letter will be sent to City/County Managers to provide instructions on how to claim jurisdictions' share for the first half of Fiscal Year 2007/08 (July 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007).

To date, all jurisdictions have received their full allocation for FY 05/06 and FY 06/07 with the exception of the Cities of East Palo Alto and Redwood City. Remaining balances from these cities will be rolled over and added to the fiscal year 2007/08 allocations.

## **ATTACHMENT**

- Sample letter to jurisdictions

# C/CAG

## CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

March 14, 2008

City/County Managers

### ALLOCATION OF LOCAL SHARE OF FUNDING UNDER C/CAG'S VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEE (AB 1546) PROGRAM – **FISCAL YEAR 2007/08 (First Half)**

Dear City/County Manager,

C/CAG is pleased to notify you that funding under the Assembly Bill 1546 (AB 1546) for FY 2007/08 is now available for distribution to San Mateo County jurisdictions. Your jurisdiction is now eligible to submit requests for reimbursement to claim your local share for the first half of FY 2007/08. The first half for FY 2007/08 includes work performed during the period from July 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007. This letter provides instructions for your jurisdiction to request reimbursement for expenses incurred.

The FY 2007/08 Program for the local cities and County share will continue to utilize the guidelines (initially adopted in April 2005) for local programs, summarized as follows:

- Half of the total fees collected minus administrative costs are allocated to local jurisdictions for programs related to traffic congestion management and stormwater pollution prevention based on the AB 1546 allocation methodology indicated in Attachment A.
- Local programs and project activities that are eligible for AB 1546 fund reimbursements and the associated performance measures are listed in Attachment B.
- The local jurisdiction's share is allocated to individual cities and the County on the basis of population share. The funds collected from July 1, 2007 through December 31, 2007 are allocated to the local jurisdictions as listed in Attachment C.

Fiscal Year 2007/08 funds are available to jurisdictions in two halves, for the periods from July 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007 and from January 1, 2008 to June 30, 2008. Jurisdictions will have the option of either submitting reimbursement requests for the first and second cycle separately or wait for the availability of the second cycle funds and submitting one request for the total funds available from both cycles. Requests submitted for the first cycle are limited to work completed between July 2007 and December 2007, whereas requests submitted for the second cycle can include work completed during the fiscal year, July 2007 to June 2008.

A reporting form is being supplied for you to request funding and to provide the information that will be needed for the report to the State Legislature. A separate form should be submitted for each project for which funding is requested. The form is included as Attachment D. Funds are provided on a reimbursement basis only. Therefore you must include documentation with the form that shows that the funds have already been expended. Please submit your FY 2006/07 funding reimbursement requests to C/CAG by **May 20, 2008**.

Please refer to the following attachments:

- Attachment A – Methodology for the allocation of AB 1546 (C/CAG Vehicle Registration Fee) revenues
- Attachment B – The programs that the AB 1546 funds can be used to support, and the performance measures related to each program
- Attachment C – Population estimates, percent of total county population, and AB 1546 funds available for the FY 2007/08 (1<sup>st</sup> half)
- Attachment D - Status report/ request for reimbursement under California Government Code Section 65089.11 et. seq.

If you would like an electronic copy of these instructions and the reporting form or if you have further questions, please contact John Hoang at 650-363-4105 or email to [jhoang@co.sanmateo.ca.us](mailto:jhoang@co.sanmateo.ca.us)

Sincerely,

Richard Napier  
Executive Director

Cc: Public Works Directors

Attachments

## ATTACHMENT A

### Methodology For The Allocation Of AB 1546 (C/CAG Vehicle Registration Fee) Revenues

- 1) Actual expenses of the State Department of Motor Vehicles incurred to collect the fee are subtracted before any allocations are made.
- 2) The balance of the funds collected are provided to C/CAG.
- 3) C/CAG retains 5% of the funds for program administration.
- 4) The remaining balance are divided as follows:
  - a) 25% are allocated to the cities and County for local traffic congestion management programs.
  - b) 25% are retained by C/CAG for Countywide traffic congestion management programs including the implementation of a demonstration hydrogen fuel program.
  - c) 25% are allocated to the cities and County for local programs that address the negative impact on creeks, streams, bays, and the ocean caused by motor vehicles and the infrastructure supporting motor vehicle travel.
  - d) 25% are retained by C/CAG for Countywide programs that address the negative impact on creeks, streams, bays, and the ocean caused by motor vehicles and the infrastructure supporting motor vehicle travel.

## ATTACHMENT B

**The following are the specific activities and programs that these funds can be expended on.  
FY 2007/08**

<b>Programs</b>	<b>Performance Measure</b>
<b>Cities and County programs for traffic congestion management programs must be included in the Congestion Management Program and can <u>only</u> include:</b>	
• Local shuttles/transportation	Number of passengers transported.
• Road resurfacing/reconstruction	Miles/fraction of miles of roads improved.
• Deployment of Local Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)	Number of ITS components installed/implemented.
• Roadway operations such as: - Restriping - Signal timing, coordination, etc. - Signage	Miles/fraction of miles of roads improved.
• Replacement and/or upgrading of traffic signal hardware and/or software	Number of units replaced and/or upgraded.
<b>Cities and County programs that directly address the negative impact on creeks, streams, bays, and the ocean caused by motor vehicles and the infrastructure supporting motor vehicle travel can <u>only</u> include:</b>	
• Street sweeping	Miles of streets swept an average of once a month.
• Roadway storm inlet cleaning	Number of storm inlets cleaned per year.
• Street side runoff treatment	Square feet of surfaces managed annually.
• Auto repair shop inspections	Number of auto repair shops inspected per year.
• Managing runoff from Street/Parking lot impervious surfaces	Square feet of surfaces managed annually.
• Small capital projects such as vehicle wash racks for public agencies that include pollution runoff controls	Number of projects implemented.
• Capital purchases for motor vehicle related runoff management and controls	Number of pieces of equipment purchased and installed.
• Additional used oil drop off locations	Number of locations implemented and operated, and quantity of oil collected.
• Motor vehicle fluid recycling programs	Number of programs implemented and operated, and quantity of fluids collected.
• Installation of new pervious surface medium strips in roadways	Square footage of new pervious surface medium strips installed.



## ATTACHMENT C

### Population estimates, percent of total County population, and AB 1546 funds available for FY 2007/08 (period 7/1/07 through 12/31/07)

		Population	% Share	ALLOCATION		
		1/1/2005	of total	7/1/07 - 12/31/07	TOTAL	50% Split*
				FY08 (1 <sup>st</sup> half)		
SAN MATEO COUNTY TOTAL		723,453	100.00%	624,290.71	624,290.71	312,145.36
ATHERTON		7,256	1.00%	6,242.91	6,242.91	3,121.45
BELMONT		25,470	3.50%	21,850.17	21,850.17	10,925.09
BRISBANE		3,724	0.50%	3,121.45	3,121.45	1,560.73
BURLINGAME		28,280	3.90%	24,347.34	24,347.34	12,173.67
COLMA		1,567	0.20%	1,248.58	1,248.58	624.29
DALY CITY		104,661	14.50%	90,522.15	90,522.15	45,261.08
EAST PALO ALTO		32,202	4.50%	28,093.08	28,093.08	14,046.54
FOSTER CITY		29,876	4.10%	25,595.92	25,595.92	12,797.96
HALF MOON BAY		12,688	1.80%	11,237.23	11,237.23	5,618.62
HILLSBOROUGH		10,983	1.50%	9,364.36	9,364.36	4,682.18
MENLO PARK		30,648	4.20%	26,220.21	26,220.21	13,110.10
MILLBRAE		20,708	2.90%	18,104.43	18,104.43	9,052.22
PACIFICA		38,678	5.40%	33,711.70	33,711.70	16,855.85
PORTOLA VALLEY		4,538	0.60%	3,745.74	3,745.74	1,872.87
REDWOOD CITY		75,986	10.50%	65,550.52	65,550.52	32,775.26
SAN BRUNO		42,215	5.80%	36,208.86	36,208.86	18,104.43
SAN CARLOS		28,190	3.90%	24,347.34	24,347.34	12,173.67
SAN MATEO		94,212	13.00%	81,157.79	81,157.79	40,578.90
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO		61,661	8.50%	53,064.71	53,064.71	26,532.36
WOODSIDE		5,496	0.80%	4,994.33	4,994.33	2,497.16
BALANCE OF COUNTY		64,414	8.90%	55,561.87	55,561.87	27,780.94

These population numbers are derived from the estimates of population as determined by the California Department of Finance.

**\* Please note that 50% of the available funds MUST be spent on Traffic Congestion Management Programs and 50% MUST be spent on Stormwater Pollution Prevention Programs.**

## ATTACHMENT D

### STATUS REPORT/ REQUEST FOR REIMBURSEMENT UNDER CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65089.11 ET. SEQ.

FY 2007/08 – First Half  
(July 1, 2007 through Dec 31, 2007)

Agency Name:	Date Expense Incurred.  From: To:	Date of This Report/Request for Reimbursement:	Amount of Reimbursement Requested:
--------------	--	--	------------------------------------

Program category for this report/request for reimbursement (Submit a new form for each project type)	
<b>Traffic Congestion Management</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> Local shuttles/transportation</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Road resurfacing/reconstruction</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Deployment of Local Intelligent Transportation Systems</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Roadway operations such as:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Restriping</li><li>- Signal timing, coordination, etc.</li><li>- Signage</li></ul></li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Replacement and/or upgrading of traffic signal hardware and/or software</li></ul>	<b>Stormwater Pollution Prevention</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><input type="checkbox"/> Street sweeping</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Roadway storm inlet cleaning</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Street side runoff treatment</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Auto repair shop inspections</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Managing runoff from Street/Parking lot impervious surfaces</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Small capital projects such as vehicle wash racks for public agencies that include pollution runoff controls</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Capital purchases for motor vehicle related runoff management and controls</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Additional used oil drop off locations</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Motor vehicle fluid recycling programs</li><li><input type="checkbox"/> Installation of new pervious surface medium strips in roadways</li></ul>

Briefly describe the project for which reimbursement is requested:
Identify the performance measure related to this project (see chart in Attachment B) that shows that this project benefited motor vehicles.

Describe the actual performance of the project based on the measurement previously identified.

Identify the specific benefits to motor vehicles (traffic congestion) or how the project addresses the negative environmental impacts of vehicles (stormwater pollution) as a result of implementing this project. Two examples of projects might be – “As a result of reducing the delay time at the intersection of X and Y streets, motorists are creating less air pollution and fuel consumption due to extended periods of engine idling. Motorists are able to reach destinations quicker, thereby making more efficient use of time.” “As a result of the removal of waste and pollutants from A, B, and C streets, toxic materials from motor vehicles will not be washed into the storm drains, thereby mitigating the polluting effects of vehicles, and debris on the roads will not be present to damage vehicles in the travel lanes or while parking.”

Additional Comments:

### Certifications

**1. I hereby certify that the expenses for which reimbursement is requested are for programs and/or projects that have a relationship or benefit to the motor vehicles that are paying the fee.**

**This includes:**

- Addressing motor vehicle congestion, and/or
- Addressing the negative impact on creeks, streams, bays, and the ocean caused by motor vehicles and the infrastructure supporting motor vehicle travel.

**2. I hereby certify that the information contained in this Status Report and Request for Reimbursement is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge.**

**By:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Title:** City Manager

Copies of paid invoices must be included with this report in order to receive reimbursement. If you would like an electronic copy of these instructions and the reporting form, please send an Email to [jhoang@co.sanmateo.ca.us](mailto:jhoang@co.sanmateo.ca.us)